

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2-4 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Particularly, Claims 2 and 3 were rejected as having an improper claim dependency. Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to depend on Claims 1 and 2, respectively, as shown herein, to overcome the rejections. Claim 3 was rejected as having an insufficient antecedent basis for “second speaker device” and “third key.” The aforementioned amendment to Claim 3 to cure the improper claim dependency will also cure the lack of antecedent basis in the claim. Claim 4 was rejected as having an insufficient antecedent basis for “third speaker device”, “fourth key” and “fifth key.” Claim 4 has been amended to depend on Claim 3, as shown herein, to overcome the rejection.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lieu et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,628,508). The Examiner has rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lieu et al.

Claim 1 has been amended herein to language regarding the speakers that was originally presented in Claims 2, 3 and 4. Particularly, Claim 1 as amended now recites a first speaker device provided on an upper surface of the main housing, a second speaker device provided on an upper surface of the fixed housing, and a third speaker device provided on a lower surface of the rotational housing. Dependent Claims 2, 3, and 4 have been amended to delete the language that has been inserted into amended Claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that these amendments obviate the Examiner’s art rejections. Specifically, amended Claim 1 calls for a portable communication apparatus that includes first, second and third speakers and a camera lens. Therefore, unlike the prior art, the presently

claimed portable communication apparatus is suitable for a multimedia environment and provides stereo sound. Lieu et al. does not show this feature, and it would not have been obvious to provide this feature in Lieu et al.

Independent Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-8, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-8 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-8, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484  
Fax: (516) 228-8516